UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/075,257	02/15/2002	Yoram Reiter	02/23338	9820

7590 08/30/2007

Martin D. Moynihan
PRTSI, Inc.
P. O. Box 16446
Arlington, VA 22215

EXAMINER	
VANDERVEGT, FRANCOIS P	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1644	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/075,257	REITER, YORAM	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	F. Pierre VanderVegt	1644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 June 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-4* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *5-14* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This application is a continuation of U.S. Application Serial Number 09/534,966.

Claims 1-14 are currently pending.

Election/Restrictions

1. **Claims 1-4 stand withdrawn** from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on April 22, 2004.

Claims 5-14 are the subject of examination in the present Office Action.

2. In view of Applicant's arguments and the declaration of Yoram Reiter filed June 11, 2007 the following outstanding ground of rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 5-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altman et al (Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. (USA) [1993] 90:10330-10334; U on form PTO-892) in view of Matsumura et al (J. Biol. Chem. [1992] 267(33): 23589-23595; V on form PTO-892), all of record.

It was previously stated: "Altman teaches a method for the production of soluble functional MHC class II complexes in *E. coli* (see entire document). Altman teaches the purification of MHC class II from inclusion bodies and the in vitro refolding of the MHC molecules. Altman teaches the association of the MHC molecules with antigenic peptides. Altman teaches that no other proteins are required for the efficient folding of the MHC molecules and that carbohydrate modification is not necessary for T cell recognition. Altman teaches that production in *E. coli* provides large quantities of MHC molecules needed for conformational and functional studies (page 10334 in particular). Altman teaches that production of empty MHC class I molecules is possible, but is inhibited by the instability of the complex at physiological temperatures (page 10334 in particular).

Altman does not teach the production of MHC class I molecules.

Matsumura teaches the production of soluble empty MHC class I molecules in Drosophila melanogaster cells and the binding of peptides to the complexes (see entire document).

It would have been prima facie obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of Altman to produce the MHC class I molecules of Matsumura in *E. coli*. One would have been motivated to combine the teachings with a reasonable expectation of success by the teaching of Altman that MHC molecules do not need accessory molecules for folding and that they do not need glycosylation to be functional. One would have been further motivated by the teaching of Matsumura that empty MHC class I molecules are stable at lower temperature and can be loaded with antigenic peptides. It is well known in the art that E. coli can be easily cultivated at temperatures at least as low as 4°C, which is a temperature not exceeding 60°C. Accordingly, the artisan would have expected to be able to produce large quantities of functional MHC class I molecules at a low cost through use of the combined methods.

Applicant has amended claim 5 to recite that the complex is thermally stable at a temperature of 60°C. While Altman teaches that the EMPTY MHC class II molecules are not stable at physiological temperatures, Altman is silent regarding whether the complexes comprising MHC class II molecules and antigenic peptides are thermally stable at a temperature of 60°C. However, silence about a particular property does not necessarily constitute its absence. There does not appear to be any material difference between the instantly disclosed MHC class II/antigen complexes that would confer any special properties upon them that would not be present in the complexes of the prior art. The office does not have the facilities and resources to provide the factual evidence needed in order to establish that there is a difference between the materials, i.e., that the claims are directed to new materials and that such a difference would have been considered unexpected by one of ordinary skill in the art, that is, the claimed subject matter, if new, is unobvious. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, the burden is on the Applicant to prove that the claimed materials are different from those taught by the prior art and to establish patentable differences. See In re Best 562F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977) and Ex parte Gray 10 USPQ 2d 1922 (PTO Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1989)."

Applicant's arguments and the declaration of Dr. Yoram Reiter filed June 11, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the declaration, Dr. Reiter (Declarant) asserts that the MHC class I/peptide complexes in Figure 1 of Matsumura are unstable at 60 degrees Celsius. In the declaration, apparently a densitometer was used to measure the density of the bands on the pages of the publication or a photocopy thereof, which is not specified. However, it is clear that the densitometer reading was not taken from the original sample itself, but from at least a third-generation reproduction (photograph by investigator, proof by publisher, printed page). The Declarant then apparently made some assumptions regarding the correlation of the density of the bands in this printed copy of the original data to the thermal stability of the material represented by the band in the picture. Using these assumptions, the Declarant then drew a line extrapolating the density of the bands in the reproduced photograph to "conclusively show" that complexes of Matsumura were unstable at a temperature of 47 Celsius with complete breakdown at 55 Celsius. The Declarant establishes this conclusion by drawing a graph featuring a straight line

representing the densitometer reading. The line is intended to "conclusively show" that the complex of Matsumura could not be stable at the claimed temperature of 60 Celsius.

Applicant's declaration and the arguments mirroring the declaration are not persuasive. First of all, the material that Applicant used for the densitometer reading was not actual material from a complex such as the one in Matsumura made by a method according to Altman or even from a gel of such material. Instead, Applicant took a reading on a reproduction in a journal or a photocopy of the journal article (Declarant did not specify). There is no possible way of knowing the fidelity of that reproduction from Matsumura's original data obtained during the practice of making the depicted complex. The photography of the original gel, development of the photographs, copying of the photographs for submission to the journal and reproduction by the journal for publication are all variables which could lead to the density of the bands in the photograph measured by the Declarant being different from the density of the original sample. Furthermore, the Declarant has provided no indication regarding how the reading from the densitometer would correlate to the stability of the Matsumura complex depicted in the photographic reproduction. Also, the Declarant provided no insight or scientific reasoning behind how the line represents a factual degradation of the material of Matsumura when made by the method of Altman. In view of the shortcomings of the evidence presented, the declaration and arguments are not sufficient to overcome the ground of rejection, which is therefore maintained in full.

Conclusion

4. No claim is allowed.

1. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to F. Pierre VanderVegt whose telephone number is (571) 272-0852. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 6:30-4:00 and Alternate Fridays 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on (571) 272-0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

F. Pierre VanderVegt, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
August 23, 2007

David A. Saunders

DAVID A. SAUNDERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER